DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 047 UD 026 265

AUTHOR Barrozo, Aurora C.
TITLE Instruction: Are Compensatory Education Students Shortchanged?
INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-24, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Compensatory Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Instructional Improvement; Minority Group Children; *Politics of Education; Poverty; *Research Needs; Rural Areas; Suburbs; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1

ABSTRACT

The instructional needs of compensatory education students are not being properly met. The ways in which compensatory education students are being instructionally shortchanged include the following: (1) compensatory education students may not be getting their fair share of district services; (2) compensatory education services are perhaps being used to supplant and not to supplement district services; and (3) certain instructional policies, attitudes, and practices may be hindering compensatory education students from benefitting through instruction. More research is needed to determine the following: (1) why some generally high achieving compensatory education schools have low achieving compensatory education programs; (2) why some generally high achieving compensatory education schools have high achieving compensatory education programs; (3) what are the instructional and other kinds of differentials between (1) and (2) above; (4) why some poorly achieving compensatory education schools have high achieving compensatory education programs; (5) why some nonachieving compensatory education schools have nonachieving compensatory education programs; and (6) what are the instructional and other kinds of differentials between (4) and (5) above. Sites in which research should be conducted are the following: (1) urban, suburban, and rural schools; (2) schools with different concentrations of Black, Hispanic, White and Asian students; and (3) schools with differing levels of poverty. A list of 38 references is included. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

6-2-88

INSTRUCTION: ARE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION STUDENTS SHORTCHANGED?

A Paper Presented at the 1986 Annual Meeting
American Educational Research Association
Moscone Center, San Francisco, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. Smith
CA Dept of Ed.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By

Aurora C. Barrozo, Ph.D.
California State Department of Education
Sacramento, California

ED297047

The Question: Background

This paper starts with the grim premise that compensatory education students are shortchanged--that, instructionwise, those who need the most get the least.

Who are the compensatory education students and in what sense are they shortchanged? "Compensatory education students" in this paper comprise public school students from the first through the twelfth grades who receive or are targeted for supplemental services from state and/or federal compensatory education programs. They are underachievers, based on performance criteria established by their respective school districts, within the purview of state and federal compensatory education legislation. However, it is sometimes the case that not all students who qualify become compensatory education participants. When this happens, federal law requires that the services be given to those "in greatest need." Such services are meant to "compensate for" certain conditions or circumstances in the student's life that tend to trigger underachievement. By nature, therefore, they should be supplemental or in addition to services purchased with local funds. In State Department of Education and local parlance, compensatory education services should be "over and above" locally funded services.

UD026265

While compensatory education is not directed at racial minorities and the poor only, the majority of program participants are from such groups by virtue of funding procedures. Funding allocations to counties, districts, and schools

are based on the poverty factor, although student participation is based on educational disadvantage or underachievement relative to district criteria. Hence, compensatory education participants live in poverty areas which, in urban areas, are heavily populated with certain racial minority groups and, in rural areas, by poor whites and racial minority farmers.

In what sense does this paper hypothesize that compensatory education students are shortchanged? The hypothesis is that they are shortchanged in terms of instruction, as indicated by the following:

- Compensatory education students may not be getting their fair share of district services.
- Compensatory education services are perhaps being used to supplant and not supplement district services.
- Certain instructional policies, attitudes, and practices may be hindering compensatory education students from benefitting through instruction.

The Evidence

Besides all the literature on differentials between instruction for whites versus instruction for racial minorities, instruction for middle class students versus instruction for lower class students, and instruction for high achievers versus instruction for low achievers, two studies conducted by the writer for the California State Department of Education have contributed to the aforementioned hypothesis. In the 1982 study (California State Department of Education, 1984), she identified 24 achieving compensatory education schools through a three-level screening process that included CAP (California Assessment Program) test performance above the school's comparison band, in reading and mathematics, during the three-year period immediately preceding the study. This was followed with a review of descriptions regarding the schools' practices in the seven criteria areas of the study: principal leadership, academic emphasis, instructional effectiveness, school and classroom climate, ongoing

monitoring, parent/community support, and auxiliary staff support. The final screening level included assurance of compliance, consultations with Department people who work with schools, and evidence of achievement gains made by compensatory education students. In regard to the latter, the original criterion of seven NCE (normal curve equivalency) gain proved to be overly ambitious and would have eliminated most of the schools without the exercise of flexibility. In October 1983, a grant proposal was funded by the United States Department of Education for the writer to conduct a second study (Barrozo, 1986) patterned after the 1981-82 study. The criteria, however, were made more stringent. The first level of the three-stage screening process required that the CAP scores in reading and mathematics be above their comparison bands during the three years being considered: 1980-81, 1981-82, and 1982-83. In addition, the statewide percentile rank of the scores for the first two years had to be no less than the 35th and not lower than the 45th for the third year. Other criteria changes included the elimination of the "auxiliary staff support" criterion and the extension of the "parent community support" criterion to include "district" support, hence "parent/community/district support." The criteria were tested on all the schools that had received federal compensatory education funds during the three years covered by the study. As a result, nine of the original 24 achieving schools and 15 new schools were selected for the U.S. Department of Education study. However, for purposes of disseminating effective practices identified from achieving schools, all the schools identified through the first and the second study were merged, hence a list of 39 achieving compensatory education schools.

To pursue further the events that led to the hypothesis of this paper, it should be noted that in 1985 the United States Department of Education called for the nomination of exemplary Chapter 1 programs for national recognition.

The application of the seven NCE gain criterion in reading and mathematics to scores of the last four-year period yielded a total of 12 schools. Of the 12, one school declined further consideration. Three of the remaining 11 schools were not on the "achieving schools" list of 39 schools. What were the 31 achieving schools doing with their compensatory education programs? The seven NCE gain criterion is admittedly high, but a close examination of the CTBS (California Test of Basic Skills) scores of compensatory education students indicated an apparently weak relationship (negative in some cases) between general school performance and the performance of compensatory education students as a group.

In 1985-86, the United States Department of Education again requested the nomination of exemplary Chapter 1 programs for national recognition. The State of California called for nominations through the county offices, but only two counties responded with nominees. Pressed for time, the State Department of Education had no choice but to make selections from its existing list of "achieving compensatory education schools" which now includes 33 schools, after three opted out of a process to validate achieving schools for recertification and three were not recertificated as they were no longer achieving.

Of the 24 schools that qualified as "achieving schools" in 1984, nine schools show gains of at least three NCE for school years 1981-82, 1982-83, and 1983-84 in their CTBS reading and mathematics scores. The remaining 15 schools show some negative effects, especially for LEP (limited-English-proficient) students. The foregoing discussion is reinforced by reports of teams that made two-day visits to schools in order to identify their effective practices. Although there had been confirmation prior to the school visitations of the schools' compliance status based on the latest compliance data available at the State Department of Education, the one-day training given the first set of

visitation teams and the two-day training for the second set of visitation teams encompassed compliance issues to watch for. The main concern was the "supplement/supplant provision." That was to ensure that compensatory education services were being used to "supplement" and "not supplant" the district-provided program, commonly known as the base program. Some of the teams explained that their time at the school sites was too limited to gain fuller information on the alleged issue. In one of the schools, there was a definite report of noncompliance, attended by lack of adequate knowledge of regulations. The writer, with the assistance of another staff member from the Office of Compensatory Education, California State Department of Education, made a follow-up visit to all the schools, stressing the remediation of needs identified by the visitation teams. Since no school is perfect nor can be perfect, indications of possible noncompliance cited by teams were not taken as cause for alarm. Rather, they were viewed as reason to follow-up and assist schools that indicated evidence of quality. That one school which was out of compliance is this year one of California's 47 nominees to the National Elementary School Recognition Program, the only 1 among the 47 that comes from CAP's performance group A which is the lowest of six socioeconomic categories or groups used to determine expectation bands for comparison purposes; that is, to ensure that schools get compared with similar schools. The Chapter 1 program of this particular school, however, made very limited gains and did not qualify for nomination to Washington as an exemplary program in 1985. However, the follow-up visit made to the school appeared to take effect. The latest performance of compensatory education students show huge gains.

The writer's experience with generally high-performing schools that fail to operate equally high-performing compensatory programs, coupled with research

reports on low-achieving versus high-achieving students, racial minority children versus white children, and low socioeconomic class children versus higher socioeconomic class children, has given rise to questions regarding instruction:

1. Are district-provided instructional services equitably given (or given at all) to compensatory education students?
2. Do compensatory education services supplement district-provided instructional services for students participating in compensatory education?
3. Do instructional policies and services favor certain types of students over others? Noncompensatory education students compared with compensatory education students? White students compared with racial minority students? High-achieving compared with low-achieving students? Higher socioeconomic class students compared with lower socioeconomic class students?

The above questions have led to a research proposal which is now in its developmental stage, including the development of instruments to determine instructional differentials between generally high-achieving compensatory education schools with low-performing compensatory education programs on the one hand and, on the other, generally high-achieving compensatory education schools with high-performing compensatory education programs.

The proposed research will test Walberg's (1984) findings, as reported in "Federal (Chapter 1) Educational Spending and Effects on Poor Children" that "more money was spent on non-poor than poor children; and less money was spent on lower achieving children than on those making normal academic progress."

What does research say about instruction for the kinds of students generally served by compensatory education programs--the low-performing poor and minority, or poor and white, or just plain poor or any color? This is not to suggest that there are no low-performing students among the nonpoor, because although compensatory education funds go to poor areas, not everyone who lives in a poor area is poor.

Instruction in this paper refers to the behaviors of teachers as they deal with and interact with students in the process of implementing their instructional objectives. Such behaviors include teachers' expectations, attitudes, emotional responses, remarks, and policy-created or teacher-created conditions that may affect teachers' behaviors toward compensatory education students. Examples of the latter are seating arrangements, grouping procedures, and waiting time for student response to teachers' questions. Without delving into causal relationships, therefore, this part of the paper will look at relationships between instruction and social class, race, ability level, and the fact of being a compensatory education participant.

Instruction and social class/race. It is becoming clear that teachers and what they do are important determinants of student achievement (Gage, 1984; Hawley, 1984). According to Bereiter (1985), a successful compensatory education program is simply one that gives plenty of help in learning. Teachers, however, tend to behave differently toward different kinds of students. Since teachers are a key factor in the success of instruction, they should have the social readiness to deal with different types of students. As Strong and Silver (1985) put it, "Social readiness may not be correlated with intelligence, but it is definitely correlated with teaching" (p. 11). The way students are treated conveys to them a message about their status (Sleeter and Grant, 1985) that can very well affect their self-concept, self-confidence and motivation, and therefore, their achievement.

In Baron and others (from Dusek, 1985), it is noted that stereotypes and generalized notions about certain races or groups may lead teachers to apply generalized expectations to students of such groups, making it difficult for the teacher, therefore, to develop specific expectations tailored to individual students. This perpetuates race or class distinctions among students, making it

"difficult for minority or disadvantaged students to distinguish themselves from the generalized expectations" (Baron and other, from Dusek, 1985). This is very significant, in view of the fact that expectations are now generally known to affect achievement. What is not known is how expectations are communicated. Since everyone forms expectancies, and teachers are no exception, such expectations may bias, positively or negatively, the performance of some children.

In 11 studies analyzed by Baron and others (from Dusek, 1985), teachers held higher expectations for middle than for lower-class students. Wong (from Dusek, 1985) reports that teacher expectations were higher for students whose fathers held higher status jobs, although the relationship was significant only for the elementary school sample. In general, correlations were high between the father's educational level and the mother's educational level and the student's academic potential.

In a study of low-income parents' perceptions of favoritism in the schools, Brantlinger (1985) reports that even when working-class children attend middle-class schools, their education often continues to be inequitable because of differential learning environments within schools resulting from such phenomena as tracking and teacher expectancy. Of the 35 parents interviewed, 27 felt that schools favored certain kinds of children and all the descriptions made by the interviewees could be categorized as discrimination. The parents recognized that their neighborhood schools were not "high status" schools and that they were aware that other schools in their district had better facilities, teacher/student ratios, curricula, equipment, and teaching staff. However, these parents appeared to have become resigned to inferior conditions.

Research findings regarding teachers' attributions for student aggressive and negative behavior (Hawley and others, 1985) are also important to the understanding of the role played by student social class in relation to teacher

behaviors. Kher and Brophy (from Hawley and others, 1985) found that ineffective teachers interpreted negative and aggressive behavior on the part of low SES students as an understandable response to home life; hence these teachers reported making only half-hearted attempts to change the behavior of aggressive students. Effective teachers, however, firmly refuse to accept or excuse aggressive behavior as indicated by their willingness to punish or even expel students if necessary.

Baron and others (from Dusek, 1985) tested for the interactive effect of race and social class with respect to teachers' expectations, but none revealed a significant result. In other words, it is unlikely that the direction of social class effect reverses itself from one group to the other. That is, the impact of social class does not differ significantly from one race to another; in this case, black or white. In studies comparing other minority groups, Williams and Naremore (from Dusek, 1985) found that teachers held higher language expectations for whites than Mexican-Americans, while expectations for blacks and Mexican-Americans did not differ. Jensen and Rosenfield (from Dusek, 1985) reported higher teacher expectations for whites than blacks and for blacks than Mexican-Americans. Wong (from Dusek, 1985) reported that practicing teachers held higher expectations for their Asian-American than white students and that this effect was stronger at the secondary level than the primary level.

A study by Scott and Damico, as reported in Education Week (August 21, 1985), found that beginning as early as kindergarten, teachers tend to praise black girls for their social and nurturing behaviors, while white girls are praised for their academic behaviors. Hence white girls are not likely to choose black girls as their friends in middle grades. These findings are based on more than 60 desegregation studies conducted over the past ten years.

Feldman (1985) reports from a study he did with Donahue that the race of the student influences teachers' facial expressions. This was based on secret videotapes of teachers as they praised their students. Then the tapes were shown to judges who rated the teachers on how pleased they appeared to be on the tapes. Both the white and the black teachers had more pleasant, positive facial expressions when they praised a student of their own race, even though student performance was identical in all cases. The Peabody Journal of Education review of "Effective Teaching" (1985) interprets this as being reflective of the different attitudes many adults hold toward members of other races. The study and other similar ones suggest two conclusions. "First, both white and black teachers appear to behave more positively toward members of their own race than toward members of other racial groups. Second, the nonverbal behavior of teachers seems to be related to their racial attitudes" (Hawley and others, 1985:13). The same source points to the especially notable fact that there were incongruencies between the teachers' verbal behavior and their nonverbal behavior--that they were responding positively on a verbal level, while being negative on a nonverbal level.

Irvine (1985) reports that the race of students and teachers mediate the interpretation of appropriate and inappropriate behavior. White teachers tend to rate black students as more deviant than do black teachers. The researcher continues that it seems appropriate to suggest that some behaviors exhibited by students of different backgrounds are culturally determined and that these culturally determined behaviors are often incompatible with the normative expectations of schools and teachers.

Instruction and achievement. What does research say about instruction for the low-achieving compared with that for the high-achieving? Hawley and others (1985) indicate that some teachers behave differently toward low achievers

in ways that communicate that they expect less of them than they do of high achievers. This induces further low achievement and increases the achievement gap. Those ways are summarized by the same writers:

1. Some teachers tolerate more behavioral interruptions when working with low than with high-ability groups.
2. Some teachers require more seatwork of low than high achievers, while devoting more interactive teaching time for high than low achievers.
3. Low achievers sometimes receive fewer opportunities to perform academically than high achievers and are, therefore, given less opportunity for corrective feedback.
4. Some teachers give low achievers less time to answer questions than high achievers and fail to give corrective feedback.
5. When given incorrect answers, some teachers prompt high achieving students more than low achieving students in the proper directions.
6. Low achieving students are sometimes praised more often for marginal and inadequate answers than high achievers and criticized more often than high achievers for failure.
7. Some teachers are more enthusiastic teaching high than low achievers. Low achievers receive fewer teacher smiles, less teacher eye contact, and less teacher responsiveness than high achievers.
8. Briefer and less informative feedback is sometimes given to lower achievers.

The above are conceptualized (Hawley and others, 1985) as a response to teachers' "patterned attributions" of student success or failure. High student achievement is often believed attributable to teachers' effectiveness or competence, while student low performance is frequently attributed to students' lack of ability or poor home environment. This transfer of responsibility to the student for poor performance probably causes ineffective teachers not to

attend to ways of fostering academic success by low achievers. According to some studies reported by Hawley and others (1985), "except in the most effective inner city schools, students are engaged significantly less in academic interaction with teachers or peers than their counterparts in suburban schools. The same source reports further that the difference means an additional one and one-half months of urban schooling is required to attain an equivalent amount of achievement-related behavior.

Mitman (1985) reports that teachers who showed more concern for lower achieving students tended to have more flexible and accurate perceptions of students, but that these same teachers were rated significantly lower on their quality of teaching. In Barrozo (1986), the classroom teachers observed had an average of 94.8 percent "high" and "very high" ratings for "instructional effectiveness," while specialist or resource teachers who provide supplemental services to low achieving (compensatory education) students in the resource rooms and/or the classrooms received 89 percent. On the item, "teacher's enthusiasm," classroom teachers received 97 percent while specialist teachers received 94 percent "high" and "very high" ratings. On "effective use of aides/volunteers," the classroom teachers received 97 percent while specialist teachers had 76 percent combined "high" and "very high." These may be suggestive of the kinds and quality of instructional behaviors on the part of staff who work with low achievers; in this case, compensatory education students.

Teachers must believe that they can intervene to stop the failure cycle. They should stop thinking that failure is predictive of failure. What often happens, however, is that because some teachers think low-skill children cannot learn, or do not want to learn, they essentially give up and stop teaching in their low-tracked classes. It is not surprising, therefore, that little learning occurs in these classrooms. Placement in low tracks is generally associated

with a low level of aspiration, feeling of worthlessness and rejection, low self-esteem, low self-concept of ability, lowered involvement in class activities, and greater test anxiety (Dusek, 1985).

There is evidence that children who attend schools in which average achievement level is high, make more progress than where average achievement level is relatively low. Low SES students make more progress in high SES groups; blacks do better in desegregated schools above a certain critical level (Murnane, 1983). Hence Garton (1984) reports that although teachers continue efforts to help the disadvantaged, no one is surprised when these students fail, dropout, or show little promise of learning.

Instruction and the fact that a student is participating in compensatory education. Is the fact of a student being a compensatory education participant related to instructional behaviors toward the student? The writer did not find research that is directly related to this section. Since compensatory education students, however, are low achieving and more likely than not to be poor and nonwhite, it may be safe to assume that the findings pertaining to low achievers, lower class students, and ethnic minority students may also apply to compensatory education students. This, however, should be considered a significant problem for future research. It may be noted that in the 1982 California State Department of Education study published in 1984, based on the responses made by more than 200 school-related persons from 24 identified "achieving compensatory education schools," the staff showed the strongest support for compensatory education. Their level of support was far better than that of the students (as rated by adults) and that of parents and community persons. This was, of course, in achieving schools where teachers were found to be generally "very dedicated, enthusiastic, and caring" (California State Department of Education, 1984:5).

An earlier study (Crawford and Kimball, 1983) reported in Hawley and others (1985), shows that the 79 Title I (now Chapter 1) teachers in early and later elementary grades studied differed on many dimensions--amount of nonacademic time in small groups, amount of instruction to small groups, the amount of instructional time allocated to small groups, the amount of seatwork assigned, the use of higher order questioning strategies, the number of response strategies teachers provided, the number of students carefully monitored by the teacher, the number of student-initiated questions, and the number of private academic contacts initiated by the teacher.

In Barrozo (1986), it is shown that the majority of those who deal with compensatory education programs in achieving schools have sufficient knowledge regarding the basics of the program. The school visitation team reports indicated where further in-service was needed, hence suggestions and recommendations have been offered to the schools concerned. On the nature (perhaps quality) of compensatory education services, 82 percent of the 235 ratings given by the visitation teams to the responses made by the interviewees were "high" and "very high." The questions posed included, among others, the kinds of remediation provided, means of reinforcing learning, the conduct of pull-out instruction, and in-class services. Although the ratings for "support of or commitment to compensatory education" were relatively low, 76 percent "high" and "very high ratings" out of 229, the extremely high percentage (97 percent) of "high" and "very high" ratings assigned to interviewee responses regarding "instructional provisions for students with special needs" seems to augur well for compensatory education students. However, there appears to be disparity between these ratings of interviewee responses and the product for compensatory education students in generally achieving compensatory education schools.

Response

What does the foregoing discussion suggest concerning the main question posed by this paper, "Are Compensatory Education Students Shortchanged?" The specifics of the question will be answered separately.

Are district-provided services equitably given to compensatory education students? Evidence from generally high-performing compensatory education schools with low-performing compensatory education programs suggests a need to implement the proposed study indicated earlier in this paper. It will also be of interest to find out what takes place instructionally in the compensatory education programs of generally low-achieving compensatory education schools.

Do compensatory education services supplement district-provided instructional services for students participating in compensatory education programs? This is really an extension of the first question. That is, if compensatory education students do not get their fair share of district-provided instructional services, does compensatory education supplant or take the place of district-provided instructional services due them? Again, the evidence of product differentials between compensatory education program performance and the total school performance in generally high achieving compensatory education schools suggests a positive answer. If this is right, certain possibilities can be true. Compensatory education services are perhaps being spread out thinly so that every student benefits, but not in a way that gives the most to those who are targeted because of need. Hence the better achievers become better and the lower achievers practically remain the same or worse, with the gap ever increasing between them. It is possible, too, that compensatory education services take the place of the regular program for targeted students, hence nothing extra is provided. Or, it can be a problem of quality and fairness--the nature and quality of supplemental services provided, which leads to the next question.

Do instructional policies and services favor certain types of students over others? To state the question directly, "Are other students favored over compensatory education students?" Although most of the studies reported in this paper do not deal directly with low achieving, low SES, or ethnic minority students as compensatory education students, the latter are mainly low achieving and tend to be low SES and racially minority. The evidence presented strongly points to a positive answer.

The writer reports (Barrozo, 1986) differentials between the ratings for classroom teachers and resource teachers based on observations of them while conducting instruction. The ratings were for "provisions for children with special needs." Of the difference, (which favored classroom teachers), the writer states, "the disparity between the results . . . defies normal expectations, since that is what specialist or resource teachers are thought to be mainly for" (Barrozo, 1986:26). However, caution is urged because of the limited number of resource teachers observed, in which case, a very low rating for one or two could have changed drastically the percentage of "high" and "very high" ratings for the group.

Recommendations

It is recommended that studies be designed to determine the following in varying situations (urban, suburban, rural), in schools with different racial concentrations (black, Hispanic, white, Asian) and in schools with differing levels of poverty.

1. Why some generally high achieving compensatory education schools have low achieving compensatory education programs
2. Why some generally high achieving compensatory education schools have high achieving compensatory education programs
3. Instructional and other kinds of differentials between number one and number two above.

4. Why some nonhighly achieving compensatory education schools have high achieving compensatory education programs
5. Why some nonachieving compensatory education schools have nonachieving compensatory education programs
6. Instructional and other kinds of differentials between number four and number five above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aluise, S. "Most Uncertified Teachers Put to Work in Minority Schools," Education Daily (August 29, 1985) 1-2.

Baron, R.; Tom, D.; and Cooper, H. "Social Class, Race, and Teacher Expectations," from Teacher Expectancies (J. Dusek and other editors), Hillsdale, New Jersey, 1985, 251-269.

Barrozo, A. Effective Practices in Achieving Compensatory Education Schools II, California State Department of Education, Sacramento (manuscript in the process of being published), Sacramento, 1986.

Bereiter, C. "The Changing Face of Educational Disadvantagement," Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1985) 538-541.

Brady, M. "Understanding the Minority Children in the American Educational System," Education (Fall, 1984), 21-33.

Brandt, R. "On Talent Development: A Conversation With Benjamin Bloom," Educational Leadership (September, 1985), 33-35.

Brantlinger, E. "Low-Income Parents' Perceptions of Favoritism in the Schools," Urban Education (April, 1985), 82-102.

Brown, B. and Saks, D. "The Revealed Influence of Class, Race and Ethnicity on Local Public School Expenditures." Sociology of Education (July 1985), 181-190.

Buckhalt, J. "Causal Attributions of Success and Failure on WISC-R Subtests by High and Low Achievers," Psychology in the Schools (April, 1985), 224-231.

California State Department of Education. Effective Practices in Achieving Compensatory Education--Funded Schools, A. Barrozo (writer and coordinator), 1984, 98 pp.

Cooper, H. and Tom, D. "Teacher Expectation Research: A Review With Implications for Classroom Instruction," The Elementary School Journal (September, 1984), 77-89.

Evans, E. "Longitudinal Follow-Up Assessment of Differential Preschool Experience for Low-Income Minority Group Children," Journal of Educational Research (May/April, 1985), 197-202.

Feldman, R. "Nonverbal Behavior--Race and the Classroom Teacher," Theory Into Practice (Winter, 1985), 45-49.

Gage, N. "Ideas Superintendents Can Give Principals to Help Teachers," The School Administrator (May, 1983), 23-26.

Garton, S.l "Improving Instruction for Economically Disadvantaged Students," NASSP Bulletin (May 1984), 91-96.

_____. "What Do We Know About Teaching Effectiveness?" Phi Delta Kappan (October, 1984), 87-93.

Graham, S. and Long, A. "Race, Class, and the Attributional Process," Journal of Educational Psychology (February 1986), 4-13.

Harris, M. and Rosenthal, R. "The Effects of Teacher Expectations, Gender, and Behavior on Pupil Academic Performance and Self-Concept," The Journal of Educational Research (January/February 1986), 173-179.

Hawley H. and others. "Effective Teaching," Good Schools: What Research Says About Improving Student Achievement, Peabody Journal of Education (Summer, 1984), 15-52.

Irvine, J. "Teacher Communication Patterns as Related to the Race and Sex of the Student," The Journal of Educational Research (July/August 1985), 338-345.

"Isolation of Black Girls Said to Begin Early," Education Week (August 21, 1985), 9.

Jackson, S. and others. "Instructional Leadership Behaviors: Differentiating Effective from Ineffective Low-Income Urban Schools," Urban Education (April, 1983), 59-70.

Jennings, J. "Will Carl Perkins Legacy Survive Ronald Reagan's Policies?" Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1985) 565-567.

Jensen, A. "Compensatory Education and the Theory of Intelligence," Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1985), 554-558.

Mann, D. "Effective Schools for Children of the Poor." The Education Digest (September 1985), 24-25.

Mitman, A. "Teachers' Differential Behavior Toward Higher and Lower Achieving Students and Its Relation to Selected Teacher Characteristics," Journal of Educational Psychology (April, 1985), 149-161.

Murnane, R. "Interpreting the Evidence on School Effectiveness." Teachers College Record (Fall, 1981), 19-35.

National Coalition of Advocates for Students. Barriers to Excellence: Our Children at Risk, Boston, MA 02110.

Pogrow, S. and Buchanan, B. "Higher Order Thinking for Compensatory Education Students," Educational Leadership (September, 1985), 40-43.

Pottebaum, S., Keith, T., and Ehly, S. "Is There a Causal Relationship between Self-Concept and Academic Achievement?" The Journal of Educational Research (January/February 1986), 140-144.

Purkey, S. and Smith, M. "School Reform: The District Policy Implications of the Effective School Literature," The Elementary School Journal (January, 1985), 353-389.

Sleeter, C. and Grant, C. "Race, Class and Gender in an Urban School," Urban Education (April, 1985), 37-60.

Stickney, B. and Marcus, L. "Education and the Disadvantaged 20 Years Later," Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1985), 559-564.

Strong, R.; Silver, H.; and Hanson, R. "Integrating Teaching Strategies and Thinking Styles with the Elements of Effective Instruction," Educational Leadership (May, 1985), 9-15.

Verliz, V. and others. "Teacher Leadership Styles as They Related to Academic Gain for Unsuccessful Students," Journal of Research Development Education (Spring, 1985), 63-67.

Walberg, H. "Federal (Chapter 1) Education Spending and Effects on Poor Children," Policy Studies in Education (October, 1984). The Education Foundation: Learn Inc., 1-20.

Wang, M.; Rubenstein, J.; and Reynolds, M. "Clearing the Road to Success for Students with Special Needs," Educational Leadership (September, 1985), 62-67.

Wooldridge, P. and Richman, C. "Teachers' Choice of Punishment as a Function of a Student's Gender, Age, Race, and IQ Level," Journal of School Psychology (Spring, 1985), 19-29.